



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,789	01/30/2001	Andrzej S. Mamona	0100.0001360	1544
7590	10/27/2003		EXAMINER	
Markison & Reckamp, P.C. Wacker Drive P.O. Box 06229 Chicago, IL 60606-0229			VO, CLIFF N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2671	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/772,789	MAMONA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
CLIFF N VO	2671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,10-14 and 16 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 4,9 and 15 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. 
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 2671

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The indicated allowability of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-14 and 16 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Matthews, III et al and Deering (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,206). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The IDS paper filed 1/30/2001 has been received and placed in the record of file.

#### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 2 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claims 2 and 12 (line 1), the word “tesselating” is misspelt. It should have been changed to --tessellating--. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2671

5. Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,492).

As per independent claims 1, 7 and 13, Matthews, III et al disclose a method and system for rotating an image using texture mapping (col.15, lines 47-51) comprising steps of receiving a command to rotate a source image located in off-screen memory, defining the source image as a texture and mapping the source image as a texture into the rotated destination area (col.16, line 58 through col.17, line 44). It should be noticed that Matthews, III et al fail to explicitly disclose a step of calculating the vertices of the rotated destination area; however, Matthews, III et al disclose the area, i.e., panel, may be defined as a polygon on a polyhedron at Fig.6. Furthermore, it is well-known in the art that such shapes are usually defined by vertices. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to calculate the vertices in Matthews, III et al's system because vertices are an efficient means for representing polygons.

As per dependent claims 3, 8 and 14, Matthews, III et al further teach the claimed feature at Fig.6, i.e, 90 degrees.

As per dependent claims 6 and 11, Matthews, III et al further teach storage devices for storing the source image, the mapped source image as a texture and the rotated image at col.10, lines 60-67 and col.12, lines 51-64.

6. Claims 2, 5, 10, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,492) in view of Deering (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,206).

Art Unit: 2671

As per dependent claims 2, 5, 10, 12 and 16, it should be noticed that Matthews, III et al fail to teach a step of tessellating the source image into a plurality of primitive vertices, wherein the primitive vertices are one of triangle and rectangle vertices such that 3D rendering with texture mapping is used. However, Deering discloses another graphics system for generating and displaying 3D images comprising a step of tessellating the source images into a plurality of primitive vertices at col.32, lines 5-21.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a step tessellating the source image as taught by Deering into Matthews, III et al system in order to make it more efficient since it would have generated a smoother and more accurate image as suggested by Deering at col.32, lines 15-17.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

7. Claims 4, 9 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### *Conclusion*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cliff N. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 305-9594. He can normally be reached Monday-Friday and alternate Monday from 8:00am-5:30pm.

Art Unit: 2671

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman, can be reached at (703) 305-9798. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-9724.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

10/14/2003

*Cliff N. Vo*  
CLIFF N. VO  
MARY EXAMINER